arXiv:1607.03826v6 [math.GN] 14 Apr 2017

Absolute $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes

Vojtěch Kovařík *
kovarikv@karlin.mff.cuni.cz

Charles University
Faculty of Mathematics and Physics
Department of Mathematical Analysis

Sokolovská 83, Karlín
Praha 8, 186 00
Czech Republic

Abstract

We investigate and compare $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes and absolute $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes. We provide precise examples distinguishing these two hierarchies. We also show that for separable metrizable spaces, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes are automatically absolute.

*This work was supported by the research grant GA UK No. 915.

1 Introduction

Borel sets (in some topological space X) are the smallest family containing the open sets, which is closed under the operations of taking countable intersections, countable unions and complements (in X). The family of *$\mathcal{F}$-Borel* (resp. *$\mathcal{G}$-Borel*) sets is the smallest family containing all closed (resp. open) sets, which is closed under the operations of taking countable intersections and countable unions of its elements. In metrizable spaces the families of Borel, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel sets coincide. In non-metrizable spaces, open set might not necessarily be a countable union of closed sets, so we need to make a distinction between Borel, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel sets.

In the present paper, we investigate absolute $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes. While Borel classes are absolute by [HS] (see Proposition 1.8 below), by [Tal] it is not the case for $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes (see Theorem 1.7 below). We develop a method of estimating absolute Borel classes from above, which enables us to improve Talgrand's examples and make them more precise. Our main results are Theorem 5.14 and Corollary 5.15.

The paper is organized as follows: In the rest of the introductory section, we define the Borel, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel hierarchies and recall some basic results. In Section 2, we recall the definitions and basic results concerning compactifications and their ordering. In Theorem 2.3, we show that the complexity of separable metrizable spaces coincides with their absolute complexity (in any of the hierarchies). Section 3 is devoted to showing that absolute complexity is inherited by closed subsets. In Section 4, we study special sets of sequences of integers - trees, sets which extend to closed discrete subsets of ω^ω and the 'broom sets' introduced by Talagrand. We study in detail the hierarchy of these sets using the notion of rank. In Section 5, we introduce the class of examples of spaces used by Talagrand. We investigate in detail their absolute complexity and in Section 5.3, we prove our main results.

Let us start by defining the basic notions. Throughout the paper, all the spaces will be Tychonoff. For a family of sets $\mathcal{C}$, we will denote by $\mathcal{C}_\sigma$ the collection of all countable unions of elements of $\mathcal{C}$ and by $\mathcal{C}_\delta$ the collection of all countable intersections of elements of $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.1 (Borel classes)**.** *Let X be a topological space. We define the Borel multiplicative classes $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(X)$ and Borel additive classes $\mathcal{A}_\alpha(X)$, $\alpha < \omega_1$, as follows:*

- $\mathcal{M}_0(X) = \mathcal{A}_0(X) :=$ *the algebra generated by open subsets of X,*
- $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(X) := \left(\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} (\mathcal{M}_\beta(X) \cup \mathcal{A}_\beta(X)) \right)_\delta$ *for $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$,*
- $\mathcal{A}_\alpha(X) := \left(\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} (\mathcal{M}_\beta(X) \cup \mathcal{A}_\beta(X)) \right)_\sigma$ *for $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$.*

In any topological space X, we have the families of closed sets and open sets, denoted by $F(X)$ and $G(X)$, and we can continue with classes $F_\sigma(X)$, $G_\delta(X)$, $F_{\sigma\delta}(X)$ and so on. However, this notation quickly gets impractical, so we use the following notation.

Definition 1.2 ($\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel classes)**.** *We define the hierarchy of $\mathcal{F}$-Borel sets on a topological space X as follows:*

- $\mathcal{F}_1(X) :=$ *closed subsets of* X*,*
- $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(X) := \left(\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{F}_\beta(X) \right)_\sigma$ *for* $2 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *even,*
- $\mathcal{F}_\alpha := \left(\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{F}_\beta(X) \right)_\delta$ *for* $3 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *odd.*

The sets of α-th $\mathcal{G}$-Borel class, $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(X)$, are the complements of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(X)$ sets.

By a *descriptive class of sets*, we will always understand one of the Borel, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel or $\mathcal{G}$-Borel classes.

Remark 1.3. ***(i)*** *In any topological space X, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_1(X) = F(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_0(X),$$

from which we inductively obtain the following:

- $1 \leq n \in \omega$ *is odd* $\implies \mathcal{F}_n(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_{n-1}(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_n(X) \subset \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X)$,
- $1 \leq n \in \omega$ *is even* $\implies \mathcal{F}_n(X) \subset \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_n(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_{n-1}(X)$,
- $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *is even* $\implies \mathcal{F}_\alpha(X) \subset \mathcal{A}_\alpha(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_\alpha(X)$,
- $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *is odd* $\implies \mathcal{F}_\alpha(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_\alpha(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(X) \subset \mathcal{A}_\alpha(X)$.

(ii) *If X is metrizable, the Borel, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel classes are related to the standard Borel hierarchy [Kec, ch.11]. In particular, each $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(X)$ is equal to either $\Sigma^0_\alpha(X)$ or $\Pi^0_\alpha(X)$ (depending on the parity of α) and we have*

$$F(X) \cup G(X) \subset \mathcal{M}_0(X) = \mathcal{A}_0(X) \subset F_\sigma(X) \cap G_\delta(X).$$

The relations between our descriptive classes can then be summarized as follows:

- $\mathcal{F}_n(X) = \Pi^0_n(X) = \mathcal{M}_{n-1}(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_n(X) = \Sigma^0_n(X) = \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X)$ *holds if* $1 \leq n < \omega$ *is odd,*
- $\mathcal{F}_n(X) = \Sigma^0_n(X) = \mathcal{A}_{n-1}(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_n(X) = \Pi^0_n(X) = \mathcal{M}_{n-1}(X)$ *holds if* $2 \leq n < \omega$ *is even,*
- $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(X) = \Sigma^0_\alpha(X) = \mathcal{A}_\alpha(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(X) = \Pi^0_\alpha(X) = \mathcal{M}_\alpha(X)$ *holds if* $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *is even,*
- $\mathcal{F}_\alpha(X) = \Pi^0_\alpha(X) = \mathcal{M}_\alpha(X)$ & $\mathcal{G}_\alpha(X) = \Sigma^0_\alpha(X) = \mathcal{A}_\alpha(X)$ *holds if* $\omega \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ *is odd.*

Note also that in compact spaces, closed sets are compact, so in this context the $\mathcal{F}$-Borel sets are sometimes called $\mathcal{K}$-Borel, F_σ sets are called K_σ and so on.

Let us define two notions central to the topic of our paper.

Definition 1.4. *Let X be a (Tychonoff) topological space and $\mathcal{C}$ be a descriptive class of sets. We say that X is a* $\mathcal{C}$ space *if there exists a compactification cX of X, such that $X \in \mathcal{C}(cX)$.*

If $X \in \mathcal{C}(Y)$ holds for any Tychonoff topological space Y in which X is densely embedded, we say that X is an absolute $\mathcal{C}$ space *We call the class $\mathcal{C}$ absolute if every $\mathcal{C}$ space is an absolute $\mathcal{C}$ space.*

The basic relation between complexity and absolute complexity are noted in the following remark.

Remark 1.5. *Consider the following statements:*

(1) $X \in \mathcal{C}(cX)$ holds for some compactification cX;

(2) $X \in \mathcal{C}(\beta X)$ holds for the Čech-Stone compactification;

(3) $X \in \mathcal{C}(cX)$ holds for every compactification cX;

(4) $X \in \mathcal{C}(Y)$ holds for every Tychonoff space where Y is densely embedded;

(5) $X \in \mathcal{C}(Y)$ holds for every Tychonoff space where Y is embedded.

Clearly, the implications (5) $\implies$ (4) $\implies$ (3) $\implies$ (2) $\implies$ (1) *always hold. In the opposite direction, we always have* (1) $\implies$ (2) *(this is standard, see Remark 2.1) and* (3) $\implies$ (4)*. For Borel and $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes,* (4) *is equivalent to* (5) *(since these classes are closed under taking intersections with closed sets). For $\mathcal{G}$-Borel classes,* (4) *is never equivalent to* (5) *(just take Y so large that $\overline{X}^Y$ is not G_δ in Y).*

The interesting part is therefore the relation between (1) and (3) from Remark 1.5. For the first two levels of $\mathcal{F}$-Borel and $\mathcal{G}$-Borel hierarchies, (1) is equivalent to (3), that is, these classes are absolute. A more precise formulation is given in the following remark.

Remark 1.6. *For a topological space X we have*

1. *X is an $\mathcal{F}_1$ space $\iff$ X is absolutely $\mathcal{F}_1$ $\iff$ X is compact;*
2. *X is an $\mathcal{F}_2$ space $\iff$ X is absolutely $\mathcal{F}_2$ $\iff$ X is σ-compact;*
3. *X is a $\mathcal{G}_1$ space $\iff$ X is absolutely $\mathcal{G}_1$ $\iff$ X is locally compact;*
4. *X is a $\mathcal{G}_2$ space $\iff$ X is absolutely $\mathcal{G}_2$ $\iff$ X is Čech-complete*

(for the proofs of 3. and 4. see [Eng, Theorem 3.5.8 and Theorem 3.9.1]).

The first counterexample (and the only one known to the author) was found by Talagrand, who showed that already the class of $F_{\sigma\delta}$ sets is not absolute:

Theorem 1.7 ([Tal])**.** *There exists an $\mathcal{F}_3$ space T and its compactification K, such that T is not $\mathcal{F}$-Borel in K.*

This not only shows that none of the classes $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 4$ are absolute, but also that the difference between absolute and non-absolute complexity can be large. Indeed, the 'non-absolute complexity' of T is '$\mathcal{F}_3$', but its 'absolute complexity' is '$\mathcal{K}$-analytic'. In [KK], the authors give a sufficient condition for

an $\mathcal{F}_3$ space to be absolutely $\mathcal{F}_3$, but a characterization of absolutely $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ spaces is still unknown for all $\alpha \geq 3$.

In [HS] and [Raj], the authors studied (among other things) absoluteness of Borel classes. In particular, the following result is relevant to our topic:

Proposition 1.8 ([HS, Corollary 14])**.** *For every $1 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$, the classes $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ are absolute.*

Another approach is followed in [MP] and [JK], where the absoluteness is investigated in the metric setting (that is, for spaces which are of some class $\mathcal{C}$ when embedded into any *metric* space). In [JK] a characterization of 'metric-absolute' $\mathcal{F}_3$ spaces is given in terms of existence complete sequences of covers (a classical notion used by Frolík for characterization of Čech-complete spaces, see [Fro1]) which are σ-discrete. Unfortunatelly, this is not applicable to the topological version of absoluteness, because every countable cover is (trivially) σ-discrete, and any $\mathcal{F}_3$ space does have such a cover by [Fro2] - even the Talagrand's non-absolute space.

2 Compactifications and their ordering

By a *compactification* of a topological space X we understand a pair (cX, φ), where cX is a compact space and φ is a homeomorphic embedding of X onto a dense subspace of cX. Symbols cX, dX and so on will always denote compactifications of X.

Compactification (cX, φ) is said to be *larger* than (dX, ψ), if there exists a continuous mapping $f : cX \to dX$, such that $\psi = f \circ \varphi$. We denote this as $cX \succeq dX$. Recall that for a given $T_{3\,1/2}$ topological space X, its compactifications are partially ordered by $\succeq$ and Stone-Čech compactification βX is the largest one.

Often, we encounter a situation where $X \subset cX$ and the corresponding embedding is identity. In this case, we will simply write cX instead of $(cX, \mathrm{id}|_X)$.

Much more about this topic can be found in many books, see for example [Fre]. The basic relation between the complexity of a space X and the ordering of compactifications is the following:

Remark 2.1. *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a descriptive classes of sets, we have*

$$X \in \mathcal{C}(dX),\ cX \succeq dX \implies X \in \mathcal{C}(cX).$$

In particular, X is a $\mathcal{C}$ space if and only if $X \in \mathcal{C}(\beta X)$.

We will also make use of the following result about existence of small metrizable compactifications.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a separable metrizable space and cX its compactification. Then X has some metrizable compactification dX, such that $dX \preceq cX$.*

Proof. We obtain dX by standard Tychonoff's construction - that is, by finding some $\Phi \subset \mathcal{C}(cX)$, which separates points of X from closed sets in X (this can be done by Tietze's theorem, because cX is normal). In fact, because X has a countable base, we can even assume that Φ is countable. The system Φ generates a compactification $e_\Phi X =: dX$, which is smaller than cX (Theorem 7.2 in [Fre]). Because Φ is countable, dX is metrizable (it is homeomorphic to a subspace of $[0,1]^\Phi$). □

We put together several known results to obtain the following theorem (which we have not found anywhere in the literature):

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a descriptive class of sets. Then any separable metrizable $\mathcal{C}$ space is automatically an absolute $\mathcal{C}$ space.*

In other words, for a separable metrizable space X, the following statements are equivalent:

1. *$X \in \mathcal{C}(cX)$ holds for some compactification cX;*
2. *$X \in \mathcal{C}(\beta X)$ holds for the Čech-Stone compactification;*
3. *$X \in \mathcal{C}(cX)$ holds for every compactification cX;*
4. *$X \in \mathcal{C}(Y)$ holds for every Tychonoff space in which Y is densely embedded.*

If $\mathcal{C}$ is one of the Borel or $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes, this is further equivalent to

5. *$X \in \mathcal{C}(Y)$ holds for every Tychonoff space in which Y is embedded.*

Proof. The statement for the classes $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ and $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ follows from the general result of [HS] (see Proposition 1.8 above). Let us continue by proving the result for the $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes. For the first two levels, it follows from Remark 1.6. Suppose that $X \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(\beta(X))$ for some $\alpha \geq 3$ and let cX be any compactification of X.

By Proposition 2.2 we can find a smaller metrizable compactification dX. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the Borel class corresponding to $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ (see Remark 1.3). Then $X \in \mathcal{D}(\beta X)$. Since $\mathcal{D}$ is absolute, we get $X \in \mathcal{D}(dX)$. Since dX is metrizable, we deduce $X \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(dX)$, so $X \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha(cX)$ holds by Remark 2.1.

The proof for $\mathcal{G}$-Borel classes is analogous.

□

3 Hereditarity of absolute complexity to closed subspaces

In this section, we show that absolute complexity is hereditary with respect to closed subspaces. To do this, we first need to be able to extend compactifications of subspaces to compactifications of the original space. We start with a topological lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that K is compact, $F \subset K$ is closed and $f : F \to H$ is a continuous surjective mapping. Then the space $(K \setminus F) \cup H$ equipped with the quotient topology (with respect to f extended to K by identity) is a Hausdorff compact.*

Proof. Clearly, the mapping ψ defined as $\psi(x) = f(x)$ for $x \in F$ and $\psi(x) = x$ for $x \in K \setminus F$ maps K onto $L := (K \setminus F) \cup H$. To show that the quotient L is Hausdorff, it is enough to show that the corresponding equivalence relation $\sim$ on K is closed as a subset of $K \times K$. This is true, because

$$\sim = \Delta(K) \cup \{(x, y) \in F \times F |\ f(x) = f(y)\}$$

(where $\Delta(K)$ denotes the diagonal in $K \times K$). The space L equipped with the topology induced by ψ is compact, because the mapping ψ is continuous. □

This gives us a way to extend a compactification, provided that we already know how to extend some bigger compactification:

Proposition 3.2. *Let Y be a topological space and suppose that for a closed $X \subset Y$ we have $cX \preceq \overline{X}^{dY}$ for some compactifications cX and dY. Then cX is of the form $cX = \overline{X}^{\delta X}$ for some compactification δY of Y.*

Proof. Let X, Y, cX and dY be as above and denote by $f : \overline{X}^{dY} \to cX$ the mapping which witnesses that cX is smaller than $\overline{X}^{dY}$. We will assume that $X \subset cX$ and $Y \subset dY$, which means that $f|_X = \mathrm{id}_X$.

By Lemma 3.1 (with $K := dY$, $F := \overline{X}^{dY}$ and $H := cX$), the space δY, defined by the formula

$$\delta Y := \left(dY \setminus \overline{X}^{dY}\right) \cup cX = (K \setminus F) \cup H,$$

is compact and Hausdorff. To show that δY is a compactification of Y, we need to prove that the mapping $\psi : dY \to \delta Y$, defined as f extended to $dY \setminus \overline{X}^{dY}$ by identity, is a homeomorphism when restricted to Y. The continuity of $\psi|_Y$ follows from the continuity of ψ. The restriction is injective, because ψ is injective on $\left(dY \setminus \overline{X}^{dY}\right) \cup X$ (and X is closed in Y). The definition of ψ and the fact that X is closed in Y imply that the inverse mapping is continuous on $Y \setminus X$. To get the continuity of $(\psi|_Y)^{-1}$ in the points of X, let $x \in X$ and U be a neighborhood of x in K. We want to prove that $\psi(U \cap Y)$ is a neighborhood of $\psi(x)$ in $\psi(Y)$. To see this, observe that $C := dY \setminus U$ is compact, therefore $\psi(C)$ is closed, its complement $V := \delta Y \setminus \psi(C)$ is open and it satisfies $V \cap \psi(Y) = \psi(U \cap Y)$.

Lastly, we note that for $y \in \delta Y \setminus \overline{\psi(X)}^{\delta Y}$, $\psi^{-1}(y)$ is in $dY \setminus \overline{X}^{dY}$. This gives the second identity on the following line, and completes the proof:

$$\overline{X}^{\delta Y} = \overline{\psi(X)}^{\delta Y} = \psi\left(\overline{X}^{dY}\right) = f\left(\overline{X}^{dY}\right) = cX.$$

□

Recall that a subspace X of Y is said to be *$C^\star$-embedded* in Y if any bounded continuous function from X to $\mathbb{R}$ can be continuously extended to Y.

Corollary 3.3. *If a closed set X is $C^\star$-embedded in Y, then each compactification cX is of the form $cX = \overline{X}^{dY}$ for some compactification dY of Y.*

Proof. Recall that the Čech-Stone compactification βX is characterized by the property that each bounded continuous function from X has a unique continuous extension to βX. Using this characterization, it is a standard exercise to show that X is $C^\star$-embedded in Y if and only if $\overline{X}^{\beta Y} = \beta X$. It follows that for X and Y as above, any compactification cX is smaller than $\overline{X}^{\beta Y}$, and the result follows from Proposition 3.2. □

We use these results to get the following corollary:

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be one of the classes $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$, $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ or $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha < \omega_1$.*

1. *Any closed subspace of a $\mathcal{C}$ space is a $\mathcal{C}$ space;*

2. Any closed subspace of an absolute $\mathcal{C}$ space is an absolute $\mathcal{C}$ space.

Proof. **Case 1.:** This is trivial, since if X is a closed subspace of Y and Y is of the class $\mathcal{C}$ in some compactification cX, then X is of the same class in the compactification $\overline{X}^{cX}$.

Case 2.: For Borel classes, which are absolute, the result follows from the first part - therefore, we only need to prove the statement for the $\mathcal{F}$-Borel classes. Let $\alpha < \omega_1$ and assume that X is a closed subspace of some $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ space Y.

Firstly, if Y is an $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ subset of βY, it is $\mathcal{K}$-analytic and, in particular, Lindelöf. Since we also assume that Y is Hausdorff, we get that Y is normal [KKLP, Propositions 3.4 and 3.3]. By Tietze's theorem, X is $C^\star$-embedded in Y, which means that every compactification of X can be extended to a compactification of Y (Corollary 3.3). We conclude the proof as in Case 1. □

Note that the second part of Proposition 3.4 does not hold, in a very strong sense, if we replace the closed subspaces by $F_{\sigma\delta}$ subspaces. Indeed, the space T from Theorem 1.7 is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ subspace of a compact space, but it is not even absolutely $\mathcal{F}$-Borel (that is, $\mathcal{F}$-Borel in every compactification). Whether anything positive can be said about F_σ subspaces of absolute $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ spaces is unknown.

4 Special sets of sequences

In this chapter, we define 'broom sets' - a special type sets of finite sequences, which have a special 'tree' structure and all of their infinite extensions are closed and discrete. As in [Tal], these sets will then be used to construct spaces with special complexity properties.

4.1 Trees and a rank on them

First, we introduce the (mostly standard) notation which will be used in the sequel.

Notation 4.1 (Integer sequences of finite and infinite length)**.** *We denote*

- $\omega^\omega :=$ *infinite sequences of non-negative integers* $:= \{\sigma : \omega \to \omega\}$,
- $\mathcal{S} :=$ *finite sequences of non-negative integers* $:= \{s : n \to \omega |\ n \in \omega\}$.

Suppose that $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$. We can represent σ as $(\sigma(0), \sigma(1), \dots)$ and s as $(s(0), s(1), \dots, s(n-1))$ for some $n \in \omega$. We denote the length *of s as $|s| = dom(s) = n$, and set $|\sigma| = \omega$. If for some $t \in \mathcal{S} \cup \omega^\omega$ we have $|t| \geq |s|$ and $t|_{|s|} = s$, we say that u* extends *s, denoted as $t \sqsubset t$. We say that $u, v \in \mathcal{S}$ are non-comparable, denoting as $u \perp v$, when neither $u \sqsubset v$ nor $u \sqsupset v$ holds.*

Unless we say otherwise, ω^ω will be endowed with the standard product topology, whose basis consists of sets $\mathcal{N}(s) := \{\sigma \sqsupset s |\ \sigma \in \omega^\omega\}$, $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

For $n \in \omega$, we denote by (n) the corresponding sequence of length 1. We can construct extensions of $s \in \mathcal{S}$ in the following way:

- $t \in \mathcal{S} \implies s\hat{}t := (s(0), \dots, s(|s|-1), t(0), \dots, t(|t|-1))$
- $\sigma \in \omega^\omega \implies s\hat{}\sigma := (s(0), \dots, s(|s|-1), \sigma(0), \sigma(1), \dots)$
- $k \in \omega \implies s\hat{}k := s\hat{}(k)$

- $T \subset \mathcal{S} \cup \omega^\omega \implies s\hat{}T := \{s\hat{}t \mid t \in T\}$.

Definition 4.2 (Trees on ω)**.** *A* tree *(on ω) is a set $T \subset \mathcal{S}$ which satisfies*

$$(\forall s, t \in \mathcal{S}) : s \sqsubset t \ \& \ t \in T \implies s \in T.$$

By Tr we denote the space of all trees on ω. For $S \subset \mathcal{S}$ we denote by $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(S) := \{u \in \mathcal{S} |\ \exists s \in S : s \sqsupset u\}$ the smallest tree containing S. By r we will denote the empty sequence ('root'), which is contained in any nonempty tree.

If each of the initial segments $\sigma|n$, $n \in \omega$, of some $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$ belongs to T, we say that σ is an infinite branch of T. By WF we denote the space of all trees which have no infinite branches (the 'well founded' trees).

We define a variant of the standard derivative on trees and the corresponding Π^1_1-rank. We do not actually use the fact that the rank introduced in Definition 4.3 is a Π^1_1 rank, but more details about such ranks and derivatives can be found in [Kec, ch.34 D,E].

Definition 4.3. *Let $T \in Tr$. We define its 'infinite branching'* derivative $D_i(T)$ *as*

$$D_i(T) := \{t \in T |\ t \sqsubset s \text{ holds for infinitely many } s \in T\}.$$

This operation can be iterated in the standard way:

$$\begin{aligned} D_i^0(T) &:= T, \\ D_i^{\alpha+1}(T) &:= D_i\left(D_i^\alpha(T)\right) \text{ for successor ordinals}, \\ D_i^\lambda(T) &:= \bigcap_{\alpha<\lambda} D_i^\alpha(T) \text{ for limit ordinals.} \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to define a rank r_i on Tr as $r_i(\emptyset) := -1$, $r_i(T) := 0$ for finite trees and

$$r_i(T) := \min\{\alpha < \omega_1 |\ D_i^{\alpha+1}(T) = \emptyset\}.$$

If no such $\alpha < \omega_1$ exists, we set $r_i(T) := \omega_1$.

Note that on well founded trees, the derivative introduced in Definition 4.3 behaves the same way as the derivative from [Kec, Exercise 21.24], but it leaves any infinite branches untouched. It follows from the definition that the rank r_i of a tree T is countable if and only if T is well founded. We consider this approach better suited for our setting.

While this definition of derivative and rank is the most natural for trees, we can extend it to all subsets S of $\mathcal{S}$ by setting $D_i(S) := D_i(\mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(S))$ and defining the rest of the notions using this extended 'derivative'. Clearly, if $S \in Tr$, this coincides with the original definition.

Lemma 4.4. *No set $S \subset \mathcal{S}$ which satisfies $r_i(S) < \omega_1$ can be covered by finitely many sets of rank strictly smaller than $r_i(S)$.*

Proof. Note that if T_1 and T_2 are trees, $T_1 \cup T_2$ is a tree as well, and we have $D_i^\alpha(T_1 \cup T_2) = D_i^\alpha(T_1) \cup D_i^\alpha(T_2)$ for any $\alpha < \omega_1$. Moreover, for any $S_1, S_2 \subset \mathcal{S}$ we have $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(S_1 \cup S_2) = \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(S_1) \cup \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(S_2)$. This yields the formula

$$r_i(S_1 \cup \cdots \cup S_k) = \max\{r_i(S_1), \ldots, r_i(S_k)\}$$

for any $S_i \subset \mathcal{S}$, which gives the result. □

4.2 Sets which extend into closed discrete subsets of ω^ω

Definition 4.5. *A set $A \subset \omega^\omega$ is said to be an infinite extension of $B \subset \mathcal{S}$, if there exists a bijection $\varphi : B \to A$, such that $(\forall s \in B) : \varphi(s) \sqsupset s$. If $\tilde{A}$ has the same property as A, except that we have $\tilde{A} \subset \mathcal{S}$, it is said to be a (finite) extension of B.*

By $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ we denote the system of those sets $D \subset \mathcal{S}$ which satisfy

(i) $(\forall s, t \in D) : s \neq t \implies s \perp t$;

(ii) every infinite extension of D is closed and discrete in ω^ω.

Example 4.6 (Broom sets of the first class)**.** *Let $h \in \mathcal{S}$ and $s_n \in \mathcal{S}$ for $n \in \omega$ be finite sequences and suppose that $(f_n)_{n\in\omega}$ is an injective sequence of elements of ω. Using these sequences, we define a 'broom' set B as*

$$B := \{h^\frown f_n{}^\frown s_n |\ n \in \omega\}.$$

The intuition is that h is the 'handle' of the broom, s_n are the 'bristles', and the sequence $(f_n)_n$ causes these bristles to 'fork out' from the end of the handle. Note that the injectivity of $(f_n)_n$ guarantees that $B \in \mathcal{D}$ (see Proposition 4.7).

Proposition 4.7 (Properties of $\mathcal{D}$)**.** *The system $\mathcal{D}$ has the following properties (where D is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{D}$):*

1. $\{(n) |\ n \in \omega\} \in \mathcal{D}$;
2. $(\forall E \subset \mathcal{S}) : E \subset D \implies E \in \mathcal{D}$;
3. $(\forall E \subset \mathcal{S}) : E$ *is a finite extension of* $D \implies E \in \mathcal{D}$;
4. $(\forall h \in \mathcal{S}) : h^\frown D \in \mathcal{D}$;
5. *For each sequence $(D_n)_n$ of elements of $\mathcal{D}$ and each one-to-one enumeration $\{d_n |\ n \in \omega\}$ of D, we have $\bigcup_{n\in\omega} d_n{}^\frown D_n \in \mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. The first four properties are obvious. To prove 5., let D, D_n, $E := \bigcup_{n\in\omega} d_n{}^\frown D_n$ be as above. The show that E satisfies (i) from Definition 4.5, suppose that $e = d_n{}^\frown e'$, $f = d_m{}^\frown f' \in D$ are comparable. Then d_n and d_m are also comparable, which means that $m = n$ and $e', f' \in D_n = D_m$ are comparable. It follows that $e' = f'$ and hence $e = f$.

For $A \subset \mathcal{S}$, the condition (ii) from Definition 4.5 is equivalent to

$$(\forall \sigma \in \omega^\omega)(\exists m \in \omega) :\ \{s \in A |\ s \text{ is comparable with } \sigma|m\} \text{ is finite.} \qquad (1)$$

Indeed, suppose (1) holds and let H be an infinite extension of A. For $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$ let $m \in \omega$ be as in (1). Any $\mu \in H \cap N(\sigma|m)$ is an extension of some $s \in A$, which must be comparable with $\sigma|m$. It follows that the neighborhood $\mathcal{N}(\sigma|m)$ of σ only contains finitely many elements of H, which means that σ is not a cluster point of H and H is discrete. In the opposite direction, suppose that the condition does not hold. Then we can find a one-to-one sequence $(s_m)_{m\in\omega}$ of elements of A, such that $s_m \sqsupset \sigma|m$ for each $m \in \omega$. Then σ is a cluster point of (any) infinite extension of $\{s_m |\ m \in \omega\}$.

If A also satisfies (i) from Definition 4.5, (1) is clearly equivalent to

$$(\forall \sigma \in \omega^\omega)(\exists m \in \omega) :\ \sigma|m \text{ is comparable with at most one } s \in A. \qquad (2)$$

To see that E satisfies (2), let $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$. Since $D \in \mathcal{D}$, let m be the integer obtained by applying (2) to this set. If no $d \in D$ is comparable with $\sigma|m$, then neither is any $e \in E$ and we are done.

Otherwise, let d_{n_0} be the only element of D comparable with $\sigma|m$ and let m_0 be the integer obtained by applying (2) to $d_{n_0}{}^\frown D_{n_0}$. Then $m' := \max\{m_0, m\}$ witnesses that E satisfies (2): Indeed, any $e = d_n{}^\frown e'$ comparable with $\sigma|m'$ must have d_n comparable with $\sigma|m'$. In particular, d_n is comparable with $\sigma|m$. It follows that $d_n = d_{n_0}$ and $e \in d_{n_0}{}^\frown D_{n_0}$. Therefore, e must be comparable with $\sigma|m_0$ and since there is only one such element, the proof is finished. □

4.3 Broom sets

We are now ready to define the broom sets and give some of their properties.

Definition 4.8 (Broom sets of higher classes)**.** *We define the hierarchy of broom sets $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$, $\alpha < \omega_1$. We set $\mathcal{B}_0 := \{\{s\} \mid s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and, for $1 < \alpha < \omega_1$ we define $\mathcal{B}_\alpha$ as the union of $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{B}_\beta$ and the collection of all sets $B \subset \mathcal{S}$ of the form*

$$B = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} h{}^\frown f_n{}^\frown B_n$$

for some finite sequence $h \in \mathcal{S}$ ('handle'), broom sets $B_n \in \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{B}_\beta$ ('bristles') and one-to-one sequence $(f_n)_{n\in\omega} \in \omega^\omega$ ('forking sequence'). We also denote as $\mathcal{B}_{\omega_1} := \bigcup_{\alpha<\omega_1} \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ the collection of all these broom classes.

In Section 5, we will need a result of the type 'if B is an element of $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha+1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_\alpha$, then B cannot be covered by finitely many brooms of class α'. While this is, in general, not true, we can restrict ourselves to the following subcollection $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\alpha+1}$ of $\mathcal{B}_{\alpha+1} \setminus \mathcal{B}_\alpha$ of '$(\alpha+1)$-brooms whose bristles are of the highest allowed class', where the result holds (as we will see later):

Definition 4.9. *We set $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0 := \mathcal{B}_0$. For successor ordinals we define $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\alpha+1}$ as the collection of all sets $B \subset \mathcal{S}$ of the form*

$$B = \bigcup_{n\in\omega} h{}^\frown f_n{}^\frown B_n,$$

where $h \in \mathcal{S}$, $B_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$ and $(f_n)_n$ is the (1-to-1) forking sequence. For a limit ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$, the family $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$ is defined in the same way, except that the bristles B_n belong to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\beta_n}$ for some $\beta_n < \alpha$, where $\sup_n \beta_n = \alpha$.

Remark 4.10 (Basic properties of broom sets)**.** *It is clear that for every broom $B \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$, any finite extension of B is also a broom of class α, and so is the set $h{}^\frown B$ for any $h \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, it follows from Proposition 4.7 that $\mathcal{B}_{\omega_1} \subset \mathcal{D}$. These properties also hold for collections $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$, $\alpha < \omega_1$.*

Actually, broom sets from Definition 4.8 are exactly those elements of $\mathcal{D}$ for which every 'branching point' is a 'point of infinite branching'. However, we do not need this description of broom sets, so we will not give its proof here.

Broom sets are connected with rank r_i in the following way:

Proposition 4.11. *For $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\omega_1}$ and $\alpha < \omega_1$, the following holds:*

1. $B \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha \implies r_i(B) \leq \alpha$,

2. $B \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha \implies r_i(B) = \alpha$.

Proof. Firstly, we make the following two observations:

$$(\forall B \subset \mathcal{S}) : r_i(B) = -1 \iff B = \emptyset,$$
$$(\forall B \in \mathcal{B}_{\omega_1}) : r_i(B) = 0 \iff B \in \mathcal{B}_0 = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0.$$

We use this as a starting point for transfinite induction.

1., the successor step: Suppose that the statement holds for $\alpha < \omega_1$ and let $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha+1}$. By definition, $B = \bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n$ holds for some handle $h \in \mathcal{S}$, forking sequence $(f_n)_n$ and $B_n \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. For each $n \in \omega$ we have $r_i(B_n) \leq \alpha$, which gives $D_i^{\alpha+1}(B_n) = \emptyset$ and hence $D_i^{\alpha+1}(f_n\hat{}B_n) = \emptyset$. It follows that

$$D_i^{\alpha+1}(\bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n) \subset \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(h),$$

and

$$D_i^{\alpha+2}(\bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n) = \emptyset,$$

which, by definition or r_i, means that $r_i(B) \leq \alpha + 1$.

1., the limit step: Suppose that for some $\alpha < \omega_1$, the statement holds for every $\beta < \alpha$, and let $B \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. As above, $B = \bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n$ holds for some h, $(f_n)_n$ and B_n, where $B_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta_n}$, $\beta_n + 1 < \alpha$. We successively deduce that $r_i(B_n)$ is at most β_n, hence $D_i^\alpha(B_n) \subset D_i^{\beta_n+1}(B_n)$ holds and we have $D_i^\alpha(f_n\hat{}B_n) = \emptyset$. Since $(f_n)_n$ is a forking sequence, we get (3) for any $s \in f_{n_0}\hat{}B_{n_0}$, $s \neq r$ (where r – 'root' – stands for the empty sequence):

$$h\hat{}s \in D_i^\alpha(\bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n) \iff (\exists n_0 \in \omega) : s \in D_i^\alpha(f_{n_0}\hat{}B_{n_0}). \tag{3}$$

From (3) we conclude that $D_i^\alpha(B) \subset \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(\{h\})$ is finite, which means that $r_i(B) \leq \alpha$.

2., the successor step: Suppose that the second part of the proposition holds for some $\alpha < \omega$ and let $B = \bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\alpha+1}$. For each $n \in \omega$, B_n is an element of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$, which by the induction hypothesis means that $r_i(B_n) = \alpha$, and thus there exists some sequence $s_n \in D_i^\alpha(B)$. In particular, we have $h\hat{}f_n\hat{}s_n \in D_i^\alpha(h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n)$. We conclude that $h \in D_i^{\alpha+1}(B)$ and $r_i(B) \geq \alpha + 1$.

2., the limit step: Let $\alpha < \omega_1$, assume that 2. holds for all $\beta < \alpha$ and let $B = \bigcup_n h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$, where $B_n \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\beta_n}$, $\sup_n \beta_n = \alpha$. For each $\beta < \alpha$, there is some $n \in \omega$ with $\beta_n \geq \beta$. Since $D_i^{\beta_n}(B_n) \neq \emptyset$, we have

$$D_i^\beta(B) \supset D_i^\beta(h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n) \supset D_i^{\beta_n}(h\hat{}f_n\hat{}B_n) \supset h\hat{}f_n\hat{}D_i^{\beta_n}(B_n) \ni h\hat{}f_n\hat{}s \sqsupset h$$

for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$. This implies that $h \in D_i^\beta(B)$ holds for each $\beta < \alpha$, which gives $h \in \bigcap_{\beta<\alpha} D_i^\beta(B) = D_i^\alpha(B)$ and $r_i(B) \geq \alpha$. □

From Proposition 4.11, it follows that no $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ set can be covered by finitely many sets from $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{B}_\beta$. We will prove a slightly stronger result later (Lemma 5.12).

5 Broom spaces and their $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ parametrization

We will study certain collection of one-point Lindelöfications of discrete uncountable space which give the space a special structure. These spaces were (among others) used by Talagrand to construct a space which is non-absolutely $F_{\sigma\delta}$ ([Tal]). Our goal is to compute the absolute complexity of spaces of this type.

For an arbitrary system $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{P}(\omega^\omega)$ which contains only countable sets, we define the space $X_\mathcal{E}$ as the set $\omega^\omega \cup \{\infty\}$ with the following topology: each $\sigma \in \omega^\omega$ is an isolated point and a neighborhood subbasis of ∞ consists of all sets of the form $\{\infty\} \cup (\omega^\omega \setminus E)$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$. We will be interested in the following systems:

Definition 5.1 (Infinite broom sets[1]). *For $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ we define*

$$\mathcal{E}_\alpha := \{E \subset \omega^\omega |\ E \text{ is an infinite extension of some } B \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_{\omega_1} \subset \mathcal{D}$, every $E \in \mathcal{E}_{\omega_1}$ is closed and discrete in ω^ω.

Proposition 5.2 ([Tal]). *If each $E \in \mathcal{E}$ is closed discrete in ω^ω, then $X_\mathcal{E} \in F_{\sigma\delta}(\beta X_\mathcal{E})$.*

In the following, X will stand for the space $X_\mathcal{E}$ for some family $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\omega_1}$ and cX will be a fixed compactification of X. All closures will automatically be taken in cX.

5.1 $\mathcal{F}$-Borel sets Y_α containing $X_\mathcal{E}$

First, we start with motivation for our definitions:

Example 5.3 ($F_{\sigma\delta}$ and $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma\delta}$ sets containing $X_\mathcal{E}$). *When trying to compute the complexity of X in cX, the following canonical $K_{\sigma\delta}$ candidate comes to mind:*

$$X \subset \{\infty\} \cup \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s\in\omega^n} \overline{\mathcal{N}(s)} =: Y_1.$$

The two sets might not necessarily be identical, but the inclusion above always holds. At the cost of increasing the complexity of the right hand side to $F_{\sigma\delta\sigma\delta}$, we can define a smaller set, which will still contain X:

$$X \subset \{\infty\} \cup \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s\in\omega^n} \bigcap_{k\in\omega} \bigcup_{t\in\omega^k} \overline{\mathcal{N}(s\hat{}t)} =: Y_2.$$

In the same manner as in Example 5.3, we could define sets $Y_1 \supset Y_2 \supset Y_3 \supset \cdots \supset X$. Unfortunately, the notation from Example 5.3 is impractical if we continue any further, and moreover, it is unclear how to extend the definition to infinite ordinals. We solve this problem by introducing 'admissible mappings' and a more general definition below.

Definition 5.4 (Admissible mappings). *Let $T \in Tr$ be a tree and $\varphi : T \to \mathcal{S}$ a mapping. We will say that φ is admissible, if it satisfies*

[1] In [Tal] these systems are denoted as $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$, but we have to use a different letter to distinguish between infinite brooms and additive Borel classes. Note also that Talagrand's collections $\mathcal{A}_n$, $n \in \omega$, correspond to our $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}$ (for $\alpha \geq \omega$ the enumeration is the same).

1. $(\forall s,t\in T): s\sqsubset t \implies \varphi(s)\sqsubset\varphi(t)$

2. $(\forall t\in T): |\varphi(t)| = t(0)+t(1)+\cdots+t(|t|-1)$.

For $S\subset T$ we denote by $\widetilde{\varphi}(S) := \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}(\varphi(S))$ the tree generated by $\varphi(S)$.

Notation 5.5. *For each limit ordinal $\alpha<\omega_1$ we fix a bijection $\pi_\alpha:\omega\to\alpha$. If $\alpha=\beta+1$ is a successor ordinal, we set $\pi_\alpha(n):=\beta$ for each $n\in\omega$. We define the trees T_α - 'maximal trees of height α' - as $T_0:=\{r\}$ and, for $\alpha\geq 1$,*

$$T_\alpha := \{r\}\cup\bigcup_{n\in\omega} n\hat{}T_{\pi_\alpha(n)}.$$

Definition 5.6. *For $\alpha<\omega_1$ we define*

$$Y_\alpha := \left\{x\in cX|\ \left(\exists\varphi: T_\alpha\to\mathcal{S}\ \textit{admissible}\right)(\forall t\in T_\alpha): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(\varphi(t))}\right\}\cup\{\infty\}.$$

For $\alpha=1$, it is not hard to see that this definition coincides with the one given in Example 5.3. This follows from the equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} x\in\bigcap_{n\in\omega}\bigcup_{s\in\omega^n}\overline{\mathcal{N}(s)} &\iff (\forall n\in\omega)(\exists s_n\in\mathcal{S},\ |s_n|=n): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(s_n)}\\ &\overset{(\star)}{\iff} (\exists\varphi: T_1\to\mathcal{S}\text{ adm.})(\forall s\in T_1): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(\varphi(t))}\\ &\overset{\text{def}}{\iff} x\in Y_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $(\star)$ holds because the formula $\varphi(r):=r$, $\varphi((n)):=s_n$ defines an admissible mapping on $T_1=\{r\}\cup\{(n)|\ n\in\omega\}$ and also any admissible mapping on T_1 is defined in this way for some sequences s_n, $n\in\omega$. The definition also coincides with the one given above for $\alpha=2$ - this follows from the proof of Lemma 5.8. We now state the main properties of sets Y_α.

Lemma 5.7. *$Y_\alpha\supset X$ holds for every $\alpha<\omega_1$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma\in\omega^\omega$. For $t\in T_\alpha$ we set $\varphi(t):=\sigma|_{t(0)+\cdots+t(|t|-1)}$, and observe that this is an admissible mapping which witnesses that $\sigma\in Y_\alpha$. □

Lemma 5.8 (Complexity of Y_α)**.** *For any $\alpha=\lambda+m<\omega_1$ (where $m\in\omega$ and λ is either zero or a limit ordinal), Y_α belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+2m+1}(cX)$.*

Proof. For each $h\in\mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha<\omega_1$, we will show that the set Y_α^h defined as

$$Y_\alpha^h := \left\{x\in cX|\ (\exists\varphi: T_\alpha\to\mathcal{S}\text{ adm.})(\forall t\in T_\alpha): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(h\hat{}\varphi(t)}\right\}$$

belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+2m+1}(cX)$. The only admissible mapping from T_0 is the mapping $\varphi: r\mapsto r$, which means that $Y_\alpha^h=\overline{\mathcal{N}(h)}\in\mathcal{F}_1$. In particular, the claim holds for $\alpha=0$.

Let $1\leq\alpha<\omega_1$. First, we prove the following series of equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} x\in Y_\alpha^h &\overset{(a)}{\iff} (\exists\varphi: T_\alpha\to\mathcal{S}\text{ adm.})(\forall t\in T_\alpha): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(h\hat{}\varphi(t))}\\ &\overset{(b)}{\iff} (\exists\varphi: T_\alpha\to\mathcal{S}\text{ adm.})(\forall n\in\omega)(\forall t\in T_{\pi_\alpha(n)}): x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(h\hat{}\varphi(n\hat{}t))}\\ &\overset{(c)}{\iff} (\forall n\in\omega)(\exists s_n\in\omega^n)(\exists\varphi_n: T_{\pi_\alpha(n)}\to\mathcal{S}\text{ adm.})(\forall t\in T_{\pi_\alpha(n)}):\\ &\qquad x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(h\hat{}s_n\hat{}\varphi_n(t))}\\ &\overset{(d)}{\iff} x\in\bigcap_{n\in\omega}\bigcup_{s_n\in\omega^n} Y_{\pi_\alpha(n)}^{h\hat{}s_n}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the equation (4) follows:

$$Y^h_\alpha = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s_n\in\omega^n} Y^{h\hat{}s_n}_{\pi_\alpha(n)}. \tag{4}$$

The equivalences (a) and (d) are simply the definition of Y^h_α, and (b) follows from the definition of trees T_α. The nontrivial part is (c). To prove the implication '$\Longrightarrow$', observe that if φ is admissible, then

$$(\forall n\in\omega)(\forall t\in T_{\pi_\alpha(n)})(\exists \varphi_n(t)\in\mathcal{S}) : \varphi(n\hat{}t) = \varphi\left((n)\right)\hat{}\varphi_n(t),$$

the mappings $\varphi_n : T_{\pi_\alpha(n)} \to \mathcal{S}$ defined by this formula are admissible and $|\varphi((n))| = n$. The implication from right to left follows from the fact that whenever $\varphi_n : T_{\pi_\alpha(n)} \to \mathcal{S}$ are admissible mappings and $s_n \in \omega^n$, the mapping φ defined by formula $\varphi(r) := r$, $\varphi(n\hat{}t) := s_n\hat{}\varphi_n(t)$ is admissible as well.

We now finish the proof. If α is a successor ordinal, then $\pi_\alpha(n) = \alpha - 1$ holds for all $n\in\omega$. Therefore, we can rewrite (4) as

$$Y^h_\alpha = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s_n\in\omega^n} Y^{h\hat{}s_n}_{\pi_\alpha(n)} = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s_n\in\omega^n} Y^{h\hat{}s_n}_{\alpha-1}$$

and observe that each 'successor' step increases the complexity by $(\cdot)_{\sigma\delta}$. Lastly, assume that α is a limit ordinal and $Y^s_{\alpha'} \in \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{F}_\beta$ holds for all $s\in\mathcal{S}$ and $\alpha' < \alpha$. Since for limit α, we have $\pi_\alpha(n) < \alpha$ for each $n\in\omega$, (4) gives

$$Y^h_\alpha = \bigcap_{n\in\omega} \bigcup_{s_n\in\omega^n} Y^{h\hat{}s_n}_{\pi_\alpha(n)} \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{F}_\beta\right)_{\sigma\delta} = \mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1},$$

which is what we wanted to prove. □

5.2 Some auxiliary results

In this section, we give a few tools which will be required to obtain our main result. If $x\in cX$ is an element of Y_α for some $\alpha<\omega_1$, then either x belongs to X, or it does not. We will address these two possibilities separately in Lemma 5.9 and Lemma 5.10 and show that they are related with the properties of the corresponding admissible mapping.

Lemma 5.9 (The non-WF case)**.** *For any $\sigma\in\omega^\omega$ and any increasing sequence of integers $(n_k)_{k\in\omega}$, we have $\bigcap_k \overline{\mathcal{N}(\sigma|n_k)}^{cX} = \{\sigma\}$. In particular, we have*

$$\bigcap_{k\in\omega} \overline{\mathcal{N}(\sigma|n_k)}^{cX} \subset X.$$

Proof. Suppose that σ and n_k are as above and the intersection $\bigcap_k \overline{\mathcal{N}(\sigma|n_k)}$ contains some $x\neq\sigma$. Clearly, we have $x\in cX\setminus X$. By Lemma 5.11, there is some discrete (in ω^ω) set $H\subset\omega^\omega$, such that for each $k\in\omega$, x belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{N}(\sigma|n_k)\cap H}$. Since the sets $\mathcal{N}(\sigma|n_k)$ form a neighborhood basis of σ, there exists $n_0\in\omega$, such that $\mathcal{N}(s_{n_0})\cap H$ is a singleton. In particular, this means that $\mathcal{N}(s_{n_0})\cap H$ is closed in cX, and we have $x\in\overline{\mathcal{N}(s_{n_0})\cap H} = \mathcal{N}(s_{n_0})\cap H \subset H \subset X$ - a contradiction. □

On the other hand, if the assumptions of Lemma 5.9 are not satisfied, we can find a broom set of class α which corresponds x. We remark that Lemma 5.10 is a key step on the way to Theorem 5.14, and it is the step in which the admissible mappings are an extremely useful tool.

Lemma 5.10 (Well founded case)**.** *Let $x \in Y_\alpha$ and suppose that φ is an admissible mapping witnessing this fact. If $\widetilde{\varphi}(T_\alpha) \in WF$, then there exists $B \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$ with $B \subset \widetilde{\varphi}(T_\alpha)$.*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction over α. For $\alpha = 0$ we have $T_0 = \{r\}$ and $\varphi(r) \in \mathcal{S} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_0$.

$\alpha > 0$**:** Assume that the statement holds for every $\beta < \alpha$. We have $\{(n)|\ n \in omega\} \subset T_\alpha$. By the second defining property of admissible mappings, we get $\varphi((m)) \neq \varphi((n))$ for distinct $m, n \in \omega$, which means that the tree $T := \widetilde{\varphi}(\{(n)|\ n \in \omega\})$ is infinite. Since $T \subset \widetilde{\varphi}(T_\alpha) \in \mathrm{WF}$, we use König's lemma to deduce that T contains some $h \in \mathcal{S}$ with infinite set of successors $S := \mathrm{succ}_T(h)$.

For each $s \in S$ we choose one $n_s \in \omega$ with $\varphi(n_s) \sqsupset s$. In the previous paragraph, we have observed that $(s(|h|))_{s\in S}$ is a forking sequence. From the first property of admissible mappings, we get

$$(\forall s \in S)(\forall t \in T_\alpha \text{ s.t. } t(0) = n_s) : \varphi(t) \sqsupset s. \tag{5}$$

In particular, for each $s \in S$ we have

$$\varphi(\{t \in T_\alpha|\ t(0) = n_s\}) = s\hat{}S_s \text{ for some } S_s \subset \mathcal{S}.$$

By definition of T_α, we have $\{t \in \mathcal{S}|\ n_s\hat{}t \in T_\alpha\} = T_{\pi_\alpha(n_s)}$. By (5), each $\varphi(n_s\hat{}t)$ for $t \in T_{\pi_\alpha(n_s)}$ is of the form $\varphi(n_s\hat{}t) = \varphi(n_s)\hat{}\varphi_s(t)$ for some $\varphi_s(t) \in \mathcal{S}$, and, since φ is admissible, the mapping $\varphi_s(t) : T_{\pi_\alpha(n_s)} \to \mathcal{S}$ defined by this formula is admissible as well.

Consequently, the induction hypothesis implies that $\mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}\left(\varphi_s(T_{\pi_\alpha(n)})\right)$ contains a $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\pi_\alpha(n)}$-set D_s. Let $C_s \subset \varphi_s(T_{\pi_\alpha(n)})$ be some finite extension of D_s. By Remark 4.10, C_s belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\pi_\alpha(n)}$. Finally, since

$$s\hat{}S_s = \varphi(n_s)\hat{}\varphi_s(T_{\pi_\alpha(n_s)}) \supset \varphi(n_s)\hat{}C_s \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\pi_\alpha(n)},$$

there also exists some $B_s \subset S_s$ with $B_s \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\pi_\alpha(n)}$ (the set B_s can have the same bristles and forking sequence as C_s, but s might be shorter than $\varphi(n_s)$, so B_s might have a longer handle than C_s). We finish the proof by observing that

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(T_\alpha) \supset \varphi\left(\bigcup_{s\in S}\{t \in T_\alpha|\ t(0) = n_s\}\right) \supset \bigcup_{s\in S} s\hat{}S_s \supset \bigcup_{s\in S} h\hat{}s(|h|)\hat{}B_s. \tag{6}$$

Because the set S is infinite, the rightmost set in (6) is, by definition, an element of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_\alpha$. □

We will eventually want to show that the assumptions of Lemma 5.10 can only be satisfied if the family $\mathcal{E}$ is sufficiently rich. To this end, we prove two more lemmas. Firstly, the definition of the topology on X gives the following observation:

Lemma 5.11. *For every $x \in cX \setminus X$ there exists $H \subset X$ satisfying*

1. *H can be covered by finite union of elements of $\mathcal{E}$;*

2. $(\forall F \subset X) : x \in \overline{F} \implies x \in \overline{F \cap H}$.

Proof. Since $x \neq \infty$, there is some $U \in \mathcal{U}(x)$ with $\infty \notin \overline{U}$. Because U is a neighborhood of x, we get

$$(\forall F \subset X) : x \in \overline{F} \implies x \in \overline{F \cap U}.$$

Therefore, we define H as $H := U \cap X$. Clearly, H satisfies the second condition. Moreover, 1. is also satisfied, because sets of the form $\{\infty\} \cup (\omega^\omega \setminus E)$, $E \in \mathcal{E}$ form a neighborhood subbasis of ∞. □

The second tool is the following extension of Lemma 4.4 to a situation where a set $H \subset \omega^\omega$ cannot be covered by finitely many 'infinite broom sets' (which were introduced in Definition 5.1).

Lemma 5.12. *Suppose that a set $H \subset \omega^\omega$ contains an infinite extension of some $B \subset \mathcal{S}$ which satisfies $r_i(B) \geq \alpha$. Then H cannot be covered by finitely many elements of $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{E}_\beta$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha < \omega_1$, B and H be as above. For contradiction, assume that $H \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{k} E_j$ holds for some $E_j \in \mathcal{E}_{\beta_j}$, $\beta_j < \alpha$.

By definition, each E_j is an infinite extension of some $B_j \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta_j}$, and there are bijections $\psi_j : B_j \to E_j$ satisfying $\psi_j(s) \sqsupset s$ for each $s \in B_j$. Similarly, H contains some infinite extension of B, which means there exists an injective mapping $\psi : B \to H$ satisfying $\psi(s) \sqsupset s$ for each $s \in B$. Clearly, we have

$$\psi(B) \subset H \subset \bigcup_{j=0}^{k} E_j = \bigcup_{j=0}^{k} \psi_j(B_j). \tag{7}$$

Firstly, observe that if $t \in B$ and $s \in B_j$ satisfy $\psi_j(s) = \psi(t)$, the sequences s and t must be comparable. This means that for each $j \leq k$, the following formula correctly defines a mapping $\varphi_j : B_j \to \mathcal{S}$:

$$\varphi_j(s) := \begin{cases} s, & \text{for } \psi_j(s) \notin \psi(B), \\ \psi^{-1}(\psi_j(s)), & \text{for } s \sqsubset \psi^{-1}(\psi_j(s)), \\ s, & \text{for } s \sqsupset \psi^{-1}(\psi_j(s)), \end{cases}$$

which satisfies $\varphi_j(s) \sqsupset s$ for each $s \in B_j$. Since no two elements of B_j are comparable, it also follows that φ_j is injective and thus $\varphi(B_j)$ is an extension of B_j. By Remark 4.10, this implies that $\varphi_j(B_j) \in \mathcal{B}_{\beta_j}$.

By (7), for $t \in B$ there exists some $j \leq k$ and $s \in B_j$, such that $\psi_j(s) = \psi(t)$. It follows from the definition of ψ_j that

$$t = \psi^{-1}(\psi(t)) = \psi^{-1}(\psi_j(s)) \sqsubset \varphi_j(s).$$

In other words, we get

$$B \subset \mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}} \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{k} \varphi_j(B_j) \right).$$

We observe that this leads to a contradiction:

$$\alpha = r_i(B) \leq r_i\left(\mathrm{cl}_{\mathrm{Tr}}\left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{k}\varphi_j(B_j)\right)\right) = r_i\left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{k}\varphi_j(B_j)\right) =$$
$$= \max_j\ r_i\left(\varphi_j(B_j)\right) \leq \max_j \beta_j < \alpha.$$

□

5.3 Absolute complexity of $X_{\mathcal{E}}$

In this section, we prove an upper bound on absolute complexity of spaces $X_{\mathcal{E}}$ for any collection of infinite broom sets $\mathcal{E}$. By connecting it with Talagrand's earlier result, we will show that, in some cases, this bound is sharp.

Proposition 5.13 (Complexity of $X_{\mathcal{E}}$)**.** *For any integer $m \in \omega$ and limit ordinal $\lambda < \omega_1$, we have*

1. $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_m \implies X_{\mathcal{E}}$ *is absolutely* $\mathcal{F}_{2m+1}$*;*
2. $\mathcal{E} \subset \bigcup_{\beta<\lambda} \mathcal{E}_\beta \implies X_{\mathcal{E}}$ *is absolutely* $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+1}$*;*
3. $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\lambda+m} \implies X_{\mathcal{E}}$ *is absolutely* $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda+2m+3}$*.*

Proof. Suppose that λ and m are as above, $\mathcal{E}$ is a family of discrete subsets of ω^ω and cX is a compactification of the space $X := X_{\mathcal{E}}$. Denote $\alpha_1 := m$, $\alpha_2 := \lambda$ and $\alpha_3 := \lambda+m+1$ and let $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. We will show that if the family $\mathcal{E}$ satisfies the assumptions of case i in the proposition, then $X = Y_{\alpha_i}$. Once we have this identity, the conclusion immediately follows from Lemma 5.8.

Suppose that there exists $x \in Y_{\alpha_i} \setminus X$ and let $\varphi : T_{\alpha_i} \to \mathcal{S}$ be an admissible mapping witnessing that $x \in Y_{\alpha_i}$. Let $H \subset \omega^\omega$ be a set satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 5.11. By Lemma 5.9, $\widetilde{\varphi}(T_{\alpha_i})$ contains no infinite branches. Therefore, we can apply Lemma 5.10 to obtain a $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_{\alpha_i}$-set $B \subset \widetilde{\varphi}(T_{\alpha_i})$. Since, by definition of $\widetilde{\varphi}$, x belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{N}(s)}$ for each $s \in B$, we conclude that $x \in \overline{H \cap \mathcal{N}(s)}$ holds for every $s \in B$ (Lemma 5.11, 2.). Consequently, all the intersections $H \cap \mathcal{N}(s)$ are infinite (and hence in particular non-empty).

Cases 2 and 3: It follows that H contains an infinite extension of B. Since B is of rank α_i, Lemma 5.12 yields that H cannot be covered by finitely many elements of $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha_i} \mathcal{E}_\beta$. In cases $i = 2$ and $i = 3$, we have $\mathcal{E} \subset \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha_i} \mathcal{E}_\beta$, which contradicts the first part of Lemma 5.11 (which claims that H *can* be covered by finitely many elements of $\mathcal{E}$).

Case 1: If $i = 1$, we have $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\alpha_i} = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha_i+1} \mathcal{E}_\beta$. If we show that H in fact contains an infinite extension of some $\widetilde{B}$, such that $r_i(\widetilde{B}) \geq \alpha_i + 1$, we can replace B by $\widetilde{B}$, and the conclusion follows as in the previous cases.

To find $\widetilde{B}$, enumerate B as $B = \{s_n |\ n \in \omega\}$. For each $n \in \omega$ there exist distinct sequences $\sigma_n^k \in H$, $k \in \omega$, satisfying $s_n \sqsubset \sigma_n^k$. We use these sequences to obtain $s_n^k \in \mathcal{S}$ for $n, k \in \omega$, which satisfy $s_n \sqsubset s_n^k \sqsubset \sigma_n^k$ and $k \neq l \implies s_n^k \neq s_n^l$. We denote $\widetilde{B} := \{s_n^k |\ n, k \in \omega\}$. Clearly, this set satisfies $D_i(\widetilde{B}) \supset B$ and H contains some infinite extension of $\widetilde{B}$. Because $r_i(B) = \alpha_i$ is finite, we have $r_i(\widetilde{B}) > r_i(B)$, which completes the proof. □

Theorem 5.14. *For every even $4 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$, there exists a space T_α with properties*

1. *T_α is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ space;*
2. *T_α is not an absolute $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ space;*
3. *T_α is an absolute $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$ space.*

Proof. The existence of spaces T_α which satisfy 1. and 2. follows from the construction in [Tal]. In fact, all of these spaces are of the type $X_\mathcal{E}$ for some special $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\widetilde{\alpha}}$ for a suitable $\widetilde{\alpha}$[2]. Essentially, the broom class only increases with countable intersections (that is, odd steps of $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$), which translates to our notation as follows:

- $\alpha = 2n \in \omega$, $\alpha \geq 4 \implies T_\alpha = X_\mathcal{E}$ for some $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_n$;
- $\alpha < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal $\implies T_\alpha = X_\mathcal{E}$ for some $\mathcal{E} \subset \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \mathcal{E}_\beta$;
- $\alpha = \lambda + 2n + 2$ for $n \in \omega$ and limit $\lambda \implies T_\alpha = X_\mathcal{E}$ for some $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{E}_{\lambda+n}$.

In all the cases, it follows from Proposition 5.13 that $X_\mathcal{E}$ is absolutely $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha+1}$. □

If $\beta < \omega_1$ is the least ordinal for which some X is an (absolute) $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ space, we say that the *(absolute) complexity* of X is $\mathcal{F}_\beta$. Using this notation, Theorem 5.14 can be rephrased as "for every odd $5 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$, there exists an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ space whose absolute complexity is $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$". By modifying the spaces from Theorem 5.14, we obtain the following result:

Corollary 5.15. *For every two countable ordinals $\alpha \geq \beta \geq 3$, α odd, there exists a space $X_{\alpha,\beta}$, such that*

1. *the complexity of $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ is $\mathcal{F}_\beta$;*
2. *the absolute complexity of $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ is $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$.*

Proof. If $\alpha = \beta$, this is an immediate consequence of absoluteness of Borel classes. To make this claim more precise, let P be some uncountable Polish space. By Remark 1.3, $\mathcal{F}_\beta(P)$ corresponds to some Borel class $\mathcal{C}(P)$. We define Z_β as one of the subspaces of P, which are of the class $\mathcal{C}(P)$, but not of the 'dual' class - that is, if $\mathcal{C}(P) = \Sigma^0_\gamma(P)$ for some $\gamma < \omega_1$, then $Z_\beta \in \Sigma^0_\gamma(P) \setminus \Pi^0_\gamma(P)$, and vice versa for $\mathcal{C}(P) = \Pi^0_\gamma(P)$ (for the existence of such a set, see for example Corollary 3.6.8 in [Sri]).

Since Z_β is separable and metrizable, Theorem 2.3 guarantees that it is an absolute $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ space. However, it is not of the class $\mathcal{F}_{\beta'}$ for any $\beta' < \beta$, because that would by Remark 1.3 imply that Z_β belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{\beta'}(P) \subset \widetilde{\Pi}^0_\gamma(P)$. This shows that if $\beta = \alpha$, the space $X_{\alpha,\beta} := Z_\beta$ has the desired properties.

If $\beta < \alpha$, we define X as the topological sum of Z_β and the space $T_{\alpha-1}$ from Theorem 5.14. Since $T_{\alpha-1} \in F_{\sigma\delta}(\beta T_{\alpha-1}) = \mathcal{F}_3(\beta T_{\alpha-1})$ and $\beta \geq 3$, we get that $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ is of the class $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ in the topological sum $\beta X_{\alpha,\beta} = \beta Z_\beta \oplus \beta T_{\alpha-1}$. By previous paragraph, it is of no lower class in $\beta X_{\alpha,\beta}$. By Theorem 5.14 (and the previous paragraph), $X_{\alpha,\beta}$ also has the correct absolute complexity. □

[2] In [Tal], the author uses slightly different (but equivalent) definition of broom families $\mathcal{E}_\alpha$, which shifts their numbering for finite α by 1.

To get a complete picture of possible combinations of complexity and absolute complexity for $\mathcal{F}$-Borel spaces, it remains to answer the following questions:

Problem 5.16. *1. Let $4 \leq \alpha < \omega_1$ be an even ordinal number. Does there exists a space X_α, whose absolute complexity is $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ and complexity is $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ for some $\beta < \alpha$? What is the lowest possible value of β?*

2. If a space X is $\mathcal{F}$-Borel in every compactification, is it necessarily absolutely $\mathcal{F}_\alpha$ for some $\alpha < \omega_1$?

One could expect that Corollary 5.15 might also hold for even α, so that we should be able to find an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ space answering the first part of Problem 5.16 in positive.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank my supervisor, Ondřej Kalenda, for numerous very helpful suggestions and fruitful consultations regarding this paper.

References

[Eng] Ryszard Engelking. General topology, Sigma series in pure mathematics, vol. 6, 1989.

[Fre] Ronald C. Freiwald. An introduction to set theory and topology. 2014.

[Fro1] Zdeněk Frolík. Generalizations of the G_δ-property of complete metric spaces. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 10(3):359–379, 1960.

[Fro2] Zdeněk Frolík. On the descriptive theory of sets. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 13(3):335–359, 1963.

[HS] Petr Holický and Jiří Spurný. Perfect images of absolute Souslin and absolute Borel Tychonoff spaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 131(3):281–294, 2003.

[JK] Heikki J.K. Junnila and Hans-Peter A. Küunzi. Characterizations of absolute $F_{\sigma\delta}$-sets. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 48(1):55–64, 1998.

[Kec] Alexander Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[KK] Ondřej F.K. Kalenda and Vojtěch Kovařík. Absolute $F_{\sigma\delta}$ spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.03066*, 2017.

[KKLP] Jerzy Kakol, Wiesław Kubiś, and Manuel López-Pellicer. *Descriptive topology in selected topics of functional analysis*, volume 24. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.

[MP] Witold Marciszewski and Jan Pelant. Absolute Borel sets and function spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 349(9):3585–3596, 1997.

[Raj] Matias Raja. On some class of Borel measurable maps and absolute Borel topological spaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 123(2):267–282, 2002.

[Sri] Sashi M. Srivastava. *A course on Borel sets*, volume 180. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[Tal] Michel Talagrand. Choquet simplexes whose set of extreme points is K-analytic. In *Annales de l'institut Fourier*, volume 35, pages 195–206, 1985.